



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,195	04/09/2004	Yih Huang	GMU-03-023U	8608
28598 7590 11/19/2007 GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER, MSN 5G5 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030			EXAMINER GELAGAY, SHEWAYE	
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/821,195

Applicant(s)

HUANG ET AL.

Examiner

Shewaye Gelagay

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on August 31, 2007. Claims 1-33 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed August 31, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicants arguments the following comments are made:

The applicant argued that Bommareddy monitors the operation health of firewalls, whereas the claimed invention does not teach such monitoring. Additionally, Bommareddy applies this type of operational health monitoring to firewalls and routers. Applicant did not point out how the cited prior art (Bommareddy) did not teach the claimed limitation specifically pointing out which limitations are not taught by the cited prior art instead applicant argued that the instant application does not teach monitoring. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "the self-cleansing intrusion tolerance system (SCIT) does not monitor the operational health of any system component", "a self-cleansing mechanism that automatically cleanses a subsystem", "self-cleansing mechanism renders operation health monitoring unnecessary", "no determination as to whether a subsystem has been compromised

by an intrusion", "even if an intrusion was successful, the intrusion would be limited to a very short window of one fast, self-cleaning cycle", "assumes that the system has been attacked or intruded ...automatically cleanses itself after a certain time period" are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant has cited different paragraph from the specification to point out how Bommareddy is different from applicant's invention but failed to specifically point out which limitations are not taught by the cited prior art. The examiner would like to point out claims are given the broadest reasonable in light of the supporting disclosure, however, limitations appearing in the disclosure but not recited in the claim should not be read in the claim. (see MPEP 2123)

The applicant argued that Goseva-Popostojanova teaches the step of auditing, however the auditing stage occurs as part of a post-attack phase. In other words, after the system has been attacked, intruded or detected an attack or intrusion, it would then detect errors and assess damages by detecting other intrusions, logging events and auditing system. The examiner would like to point out Goseva-Popostojanova teaches an auditing capability which meets the claimed limitation. In addition, it is not necessary the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by the applicant. (see MPEP 2144)

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-10, 12-24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bommareddy et al. (hereinafter Bommareddy) US Patent Number 6,880,089.

As per claims 1 and 16:

Bommareddy a self-cleansing system comprising:

a) at least two subsystems, said at least two subsystems including an active subsystem and at least one available inactive subsystem; (col. 15, lines 66-67)

b) a communications link connecting said at least two subsystems; (figure 8)

c) a local network capable of connecting said at least two subsystems to an external network; (figure 8)

d) an arbitration mechanism capable of designating one of said at least one available inactive subsystem to be a designated active system; (figure 8)

e) an IP address shared by at least said active subsystem and said designated active subsystem, only said active subsystem utilizing said IP address to output information to said external network; (col. 16, lines 4-13)

f) a transfer mechanism capable of:

- i) deactivating said active subsystem, causing said active subsystem to become a deactivated subsystem; (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39) and
- ii) activating said designated active subsystem, causing said designated active subsystem to become said active subsystem; (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39) and

g) a self-cleansing mechanism capable of cleansing said deactivated subsystem, causing said deactivated subsystem to become one of said at least one available inactive subsystem. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claims 2 and 17:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said arbitration mechanism uses a criterion to select which of said at least one available inactive subsystem is to be designated said designated active subsystem. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claim 3:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said transfer mechanism is activated by a transfer criterion. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claim 4 and 18:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said transfer criterion is a fault detection criterion. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claims 5 and 19:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said transfer criterion is an intrusion detection criterion. (col. 3, lines 35-37; col. 8, lines 52-60; col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39; col. 23, lines 61-67)

As per claim 6 and 20:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said transfer criterion considers time. (col. 19, lines 1-4)

As per claim 7 and 21:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein at least two of said at least two subsystems are firewalls. (figure 1)

As per claim 8 and 22:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein at least two of said at least two subsystems are servers. (col. 3, lines 26-30)

As per claim 9 and 23:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein at least two of said at least two subsystems are gateways. (col. 4, lines 23-30)

As per claim 10 and 24:

Bommareddy further teaches a system further include integrity check capability. (col. 3, lines 35-37; col. 8, lines 52-60; col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39; col. 23, lines 61-67)

As per claim 12 and 26:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said self-cleansing mechanism includes a capability to reboot at least one of said at least two subsystems. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claim 13:

Bommareddy further teaches a system further including shared storage accessible by at least two of said at least two subsystems. (col. 6, lines 36-41)

As per claim 14:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said communications link is part of said local network. (figure 1)

As per claim 15 and 27:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said active subsystem is a plurality of active subsystems. (col. 15, lines 66-67)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bommareddy et al. (hereinafter Bommareddy) US Patent Number 6,880,089 in

view of Goseva-Popstojanova et al. (hereinafter Goseva) US Publication Number 2003/0033542.

As per claims 11 and 25:

Bommareddy does not explicitly disclose a system including step of auditing said system cleansing actions. Goseva in analogous art, however, discloses a system including step of auditing said system cleansing actions. (page 3, paragraphs 29-31) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Bommareddy with Goseva in order to have a system that provides an independent examination of records and events to ensure compliance with established procedures. (page 3, paragraph 29; Goseva)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number:
10/821,195
Art Unit: 2137

Page 9

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shewaye Gelagay 


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER